

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1973

February 5, 1973

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 5, 1973" (1973). *Minutes*. 525.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/525

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

E A S T E R N I L L I N O I S U N I V E R S I T Y

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of February 5, 1973

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doughty, Elliott, Katsimpalis, Downs, Wiseman, Maurer, Knott, Trank, MacLaren, Owens, Shuff, Lenihan, Whalin

MEMBERS ABSENT: Smith, Johnson

FACULTY VISITORS: A. Blankenbaker, G. Hackler, J. Martin

The minutes of January 29, 1973 were approved. A note was made of the Representation of Business under the Ad Hoc Committee's report on Restructuring of University Councils (Item III). The Committee failed to show rotation of the Business members. (vol. 1 - 40)

EXECUTIVE REPORT

Lenihan presented the letter to President Fite concerning the Senate's comments on the Student Bill of Rights.

A motion was made by Downs, seconded by Doughty, to publish the letter to the President on the Student Bill of Rights. (See Appendix A) The motion passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Downs reported on the Re-election policy. Faculty members may run for re-election on committees other than the Personnel Committee.

At this point the regular order of business was interrupted so that President Fite could speak to the Senate. President Fite reported that he will recommend to the Board of Governors the development of a school of Fine Arts.

President Fite also discussed Faculty evaluation. He indicated that the Board of Governors is looking into an evaluation policy.

The Budget was also discussed in terms of what Eastern may actually expect to receive. The main point of concern is that a certain part of the budget must be generated from within the University. Any announcement for allocated funds to Eastern will probably include this internally produced fund.

Eastern's First Honorary Degree and Distinguished Alumni award, according to President Fite, will be made at the May Commencement this year. This is assuming that the Board of Governors approves of the action.

2. In the absence of Maurer, the Textbook Rental Plan was postponed.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Letter from Richard Funk. (See Appendix B)
2. Letter from R. Hennings. (See Appendix C)
3. Letter from R. White. (See Appendix D)
4. Letter from Dean Hamand. (See Appendix E)

5. Proposed Art Board By-Laws. Trank indicated that this is a Student-Faculty Board similar to other boards

A motion was made by Owens, seconded by Shuff, to endorse the Art Board By-Laws. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Downs, seconded by Maurer, to approve a potential list of names of persons to serve on the Art Board. The motion passed with 11 yes, 2 abstentions.

At this point the order of business was set aside so that Maurer who recently arrived could give the report of the Textbook Rental Committee. (See Appendix F)

A motion was made by Maurer, seconded by Trank, to approve the report of the Textbook Rental Library Committee. The motion failed with 5 yes, 6 no, 2 abstentions.

At the conclusion of this committee report, the Senate returned to Communications received.

6. Letter from R. Carey on the Textbook Rental Study. Carey recommended retention of our present Textbook Library.
7. Memorandum from R. Hinson on meeting times of the Council on Teacher Evaluation.
8. Minutes of the Council on University Planning for 24 January, 1973.
9. Letter of appreciation from Allen Grosboll on the Student Bill of Rights.
10. Minutes of the Council of Instructional Officers for 30 January, 1973.

A motion was made by Owens, seconded by Doughty, to publish the minutes of the Council of Instructional Officers. (See Appendix G) Motion passed with 7 yes, 5 abstentions.

11. Minutes of the Student Senate 23 January, 1973.
12. Minutes of the Council of Faculties of 8 January, 1973.
13. Letter from L. Wood on BOG draft statement on evaluation policy.

A motion was made by Doughty, Seconded by Whalin, to publish the memorandum from L. Wood. (See Appendix H) The motion passed unanimously.

A GENERAL FACULTY MEETING FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE EVALUATION POLICY WAS CALLED FOR FEBRUARY 19, 1973, AT 13:00. THE MEETING WILL BE HELD IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AUDITORIUM.

14. Report from G. Rommel of the Council of Faculties.

A motion was made by Maurer, seconded by Downs, to publish the report of G. Rommel. (See Appendix I) The motion passed unanimously.

15. Memorandum from J. LeDuc on Personnel Evaluation.

A motion was made by Whalin, seconded by Trank, to publish the memorandum from J. LeDuc. (See Appendix J) The motion passed with 8 yes, 4 abstentions.

16. Memorandum from J. Giffin on School of Business ommission from Ad Hoc Committee's report on Restructuring University Councils.
17. Copy of a memorandum to J. Connelly, chairman, Council on Academic Affairs from R. White.

OLD BUSINESS

The tabled report on Restructuring of University Councils was opened for discussion. Elliott presented the Study Committee's report. He indicated that a change would be made in Business representation. After considerable discussion, the following motion was made.

A motion was made by Elliott, seconded by MacLaren, to approve the majority of the Ad Hoc Committee report on Restructuring University Councils. The motion failed with 1 yes, 6 no, 4 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 13:55.

The next meeting will be held on February 12, 1973 at noon.

AGENDA

1. By-Laws
2. Restructuring of University Councils
3. Student Bill of Rights
4. Textbook Rental Plan
5. Criteria for Distinguished Faculty Award, February 12, 1973

Robert C. Wiseman
Secretary

Appendix A

February 1, 1973

Dr. Gilbert Fite, President
Eastern Illinois University

Dear President Fite:

The Faculty Senate discussed The Student Bill of Rights dated December 7, 1972 and the list of amendments dated January 18, 1973. The discussion resulted in the following recommendations.

Article II Section 1

The Senate felt that the phrase "formal participation" should be clarified. The Senate strongly opposed student participation on departmental and University Personnel Committees.

Article V Section 3

The Senate feels that clarification is needed to insure that this clause applies only to cases under the jurisdiction of The Student Court.

Article VIII Section 3

The Senate recommends that in order for any campus organization to be recognized it must have a Faculty Advisor. The Senate recommends that the clause beginning "and institutional recognition . . . to secure an advisor." be removed from this section.

Article VIII Section 5

The Senate recommends that the clause "subject to university regulations." be added. The sentence will then read "...and posters shall be permitted subject to university regulations."

The reason that the Faculty Senate has so few objections to the Student Bill of Rights is that there was extensive consultation between a Committee of The Faculty Senate and The Student Bill of Rights Committee at The Student Senate. Most disagreements were worked out before The Bill of Rights was presented to The Faculty Senate.

Robert C. Wiseman, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Patrick M. Lenihan, Chairman
Faculty Senate

Appendix B

TO: Doctor Lenihan, Chairman
Faculty Senate

February 2, 1973

I would like to see the Senate modify the Ad Hoc Committee's proposal for the restructuring of the University Councils.

I recommend that the representation of Arts and Science and of Education on the CGS be exactly the same as it is for the COTE. I believe that even though there may be more masters degree students graduating from Education departments than from Arts and Science departments, the degree of diversity among the departments in Arts and Science is so

Appendix B (cont.)

much greater than variety of opinion on academic matters would more likely be obtained by having equal representation by the two areas on the CGS.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard C. Funk
Associate Professor of Zoology

Appendix C

TO: Faculty Senate

2 February 1973

FROM: Robert Hennings

RE: University Councils

Although the proposed restructuring of University Councils has obviously occasioned careful study and thought, the plan published in your Minutes of January 29, 1973, will in my estimation have the unfortunate effect of inviting continual dissatisfaction since the relative weight of the various constituencies is bound to change from year to year. I therefore am in complete agreement with Professor Trank and believe that all present University Councils should continue to be elected at large.

Robert Hennings

Appendix D

MEMORANDUM

4 Feb 73

To: Faculty Senate

From: R. White, English

The original proposal for restructuring University councils (Senate minutes of 2 Oct 72) seemed to me most unfortunate. The latest proposal (Senate minutes of 29 Jan 73) is a striking change for the worse.

In October I thought to suggest the undesirability of area representation by a reductio ad absurdum proposal for proportioning membership according to credit-hour production. Incredibly, the modest proposal seems to have been taken not as ironic but straight, for real--as if a department chairman who daily fights the entire concept of credit-hour production would want its use even further extended than it is.

No, faculty councils at the University level ought not be adversary structures but faculty councils, not battlegrounds for interschool rivalries but conference tables for clarifying University needs and policies. A faculty member sufficiently respected by colleagues to be elected to a University council ought be capable of acting for the good of the University. A system of area representation will force that same independent faculty member to become parochial, chauvinistic, short-viewed, and prejudiced in the worst sense.

I urge the Senate to adopt Professor Trank's minority report, or some version of it--his suggested resources for the COTE seem unduly narrow.

cc: The Provost

R. White

Appendix E

TO: Faculty Senate

DATE: February 5, 1973

Subject: Report, Ad Hoc Committee--Restructuring of University Councils

The Senate requested "faculty comment" on the Ad Hoc Committee's report and I am going to be presumptuous and assume a little ole dean can comment too.

After studying the recommended representation for the CGS, I compiled from my graduation certification book the degree production for the past year (Wtr. Qtr., '71- '72, thru Fall Qtr., '72) and came up with these figures:

A & S	145
School of Business	56
School of Education	154
Remaining Schools	70

Based on the above statistics, A. & S. deserves equal representation with Education and P.E. (which produced 41 of those listed under "Remaining Schools") is nearly equal to Business. Recommended is the following representation:

A & S	4
Ed.	4
Bus.	1
P.E.	1
Remaining Schools	1
Students	2

I am uncertain where the committee got its degree production figures but assure the Senate mine are accurate.

L. M. Hamand
Dean, Graduate School

Appendix F

February 5, 1973

Report of the Faculty Senate Textbook Library Committee

1. The Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate establish an ad hoc Textbook Library Committee. The Committee ought to include several members of the Faculty Senate and several students appointed by the Student Senate.
2. The Committee believes that the textbook library system has inherent theoretical and practical disadvantages. The Committee also believes that a "sales" system has problems.
3. If the Faculty Senate approves the recommendation to establish an ad hoc committee, it should charge the committee to explore, but not limit itself to, the following areas:
 - a. Explore the theoretical and practical problems of the rental and sales system.
 - b. Limits on expenditures by the student for materials for any one course.
 - c. Possibility of fees being established for courses in special subject matter areas (sciences, music, art, etc.) where materials beyond the normal textbook

Appendix F (cont.)

are needed for instructional purposes. In order to keep these fees as low as possible, the Committee should explore ways that the University could help in the purchase of these materials and bear part of the expense.

- d. The establishment of a scholarship and/or loan fund to help the student purchase texts.
- e. The establishment of a system and facilities for the exchange of textbooks.
- f. Determine, if change is desirable, whether immediate or eventual abolition should be adopted and whether the University should establish a bookstore.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Shuff
June Johnson
David Maurer

Appendix G

TO: The Council of Instructional Officers

SUBJECT: Proceedings

January 30, 1973

The Council of Instructional Officers met at 1400 on Wednesday, January 23, 1973 in the President's Conference Room.

Present were Coleman, Giffin, Hare, Lowell, Merigis, Moody, Ringenberg, Scholes, Swope, and Szerenyi. Absent was Hamand.

Discussion Item 1 was consideration of a proposal on midterm grades which the CAA had approved on January 4, 1973 to recommend to the CIO as an operating policy. The members of the CIO approved the recommendation by consensus. It was noted that the students had requested that the grades not be transmitted to parents, but the CIO's position is that--whatever course the Dean of Students takes after the grades are reported to his office--is not really a concern of the CIO.

Item 2 was a discussion of the need for printed conversion directives in the form of adviser information and student handouts. Denas were asked to see that conversion guides or directives are prepared and that copies are furnished Dean Taber, the Advisement Center, the department advisers, and that they be made available to students.

Other items discussed to greater or lesser extent were:

- 1) budgets--which are due at Vice President Moody's Office on January 26.
- 2) the application or use of the Denas' "adjustment units" discussed at a previous meeting with the President and the University Personnel Committee.
- 3) the student-faculty ratio at EIU in comparison with other similar institutions. In most cases, Eastern seems to suffer by comparison.
- 4) the number of applications from new and transfer students in comparison with former years. The number is down.

The meeting adjourned at 1600.

James F. Giffin, Secretary

cc: President Fite
Vice Presidents Williams, Schaefer, Holt
Dean Taber
Mr. Martin, Records Office

Department Heads
Archives, Library
President, Student Body
Chairman, Faculty Senate

Appendix H

TO: Faculty Senate
DATE: January 29, 1973

FROM: Chairman, University Personnel
Committee
SUBJECT: BOG draft statement on evaluation policy

The following represents the position taken in December by the University Personnel Committee respecting the Nov. 16, 1972 BOG draft statement on evaluation policies.

In the view of the University Personnel Committee, policies respecting personnel evaluation are best handled locally by each institution under the Board of Governors. Most of the matters touched upon in the draft statement of 16 November, 1972 are already the subject of detailed policies and procedures at Eastern.

The University Personnel Committee is wary of any philosophy of evaluation which accepts as valid the notion that academic and scholarly performance can be measured by formulas that are suitable for business and industry. The term "job description" suggests that academic performance, if it is up to standard, is everywhere the same, that it can be measured, and that a faculty member is presumable doing the job well or poorly in relationship to the description of the job he was hired to do. To believe that academic performance can be measured in standard units that are concrete and everywhere the same, is to misunderstand, distort, and pervert the whole educational process.

To say that the objective of evaluation is to "improve the institution's services" implies again that a university is somehow like an industrial concern. Of course, a university wants to provide the best services possible for its students and for the public. It will require an able and efficient administration to achieve this goal. But this is not the mission of the institution. The mission of a university is far more complex and subtle and cannot be measured in terms of services and job descriptions.

The quality of the university's faculty will determine the quality of the institution. Faculty quality is not measurable in any precise way. A good faculty member is usually one who has attained an advanced degree from a reputable institution and who as a teacher has over the years gained a reputation for effective teaching and scholarly productivity. This reputation cannot be represented by punched holes on an IBM card. It is, nonetheless, clearly recognizable--not always by students, not always by a democratically elected faculty committee, not always by deans and other administrators, but almost always by generally accepted standards established by the individual disciplines.

Strong academic departments will have little difficulty reaching reliable evaluations of their members, making their judgments on an autonomous or nearly autonomous basis. Weak departments will not be helped much by having those decisions imposed upon them by "students, peers, or outside administrators."

Although evaluation procedures are needed for efficiency in administration, they should be just that--procedures--not criteria for evaluation. At Eastern we leave the development of evaluation criteria to individual disciplines. We can improve performance and the quality of the education we offer by stress on academic excellence, which means giving our attention to upgrading standards of admission and achievement and providing a more favorable atmosphere for research and investigation which, more than anything else, give an academic institution its reputation.

There is this to be said for the draft statement. It is consistent with the Scope and Mission statement released earlier in its acceptance of the philosophy that a college education is a service which, in institutions under the Board of Governors, can be packaged like any other commodity.

Leonard C. Wood, Chairman

Appendix I

TO: Dr. Pat Lenihan
FOR: the Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Board policy change--maternity leave

February 2, 1973

Recently the Council of Faculties and the Board of Governors have been considering changes in the Board's By-Laws and Governing Policies regarding maternity leave. In the past, practices varied as to whether the leave was paid or not. Some received pay for the whole period; others, only up to the thirty days allowed by the By-Law which treats pregnancy as a special, distinctive illness whose thirty paid days do not count against one's sick leave. A pregnant faculty member can be placed on maternity leave by the Board either upon her own request or upon the recommendation of the President of her institution.

In the light of today's concern for the equal rights of women, the policy is out-moded. The decision to go on maternity leave should be hers and her physician's. The Board of Governors should then be able to grant her a maternity leave at her request only. Pregnancy is a temporary disability and should be treated no differently from sick-leave provisions for any other illness or injury. Reinstatement of rights, pension, vacations, seniority, insurance coverage, sick pay, and other benefits must be given to women on maternity leave.

The intent of the Council of Faculties is to have the Board's policy reflect the sex-equality provisions of the federal Higher Education Act of 1972, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the federal guidelines as adopted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission--not to overlook the impact of recent court decisions and the need to update policy. The position of the discrimination is treating each person, not on the basis of group membership, but on the basis of individual capacity to work."

Mr. Richard T. Dunn, Legal Counsel to the Board, has proposed removal of the present maternity leave policy and inclusion of a statement (not yet formed or approved) to the By-Laws, p. 34, under 6.2 "Illness and Disability" so that pregnancy will receive the same sick-leave benefits as other sicknesses or disabilities.

I would appreciate your including this statement in the Minutes for faculty consideration and comment.

George W. Rommel
Council of Faculties

Appendix J

Memo

TO: Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Evaluation

DATE: 2-1-73
FROM: John LeDuc

My reaction to the proposed BG Non-Civil Service Personnel Evaluations Policy is that it is nonsense. When the BG lists priorities, develops a set of specific written performance objectives and responsibilities and/or a definitive annotated job description for each institution, the institutions can follow suit for instructional and administrative units. They in turn can provide this structure to departments and finally to the staff. Until this has been done, what is proposed is pure nonsense.

To illustrate this point, I would point out that this year instructional units were treated as equal. As a result, an above average member of an above average department is no better off than the average member of the average department. We are forced to

judge each other but the administration (right through the BG) refuses to make judgements about units under them.

The end result of this evaluation madness could well be the destruction of the fragile treads of common interest that comprise a department. This will have been accomplished through the promotion of the cult of individuality.

Let me point out that the present state of affairs is the result of imposing a business structure on an educational enterprise. This accountability and efficiency model worked well for a while in the business world but it seems to have led to almost insolvable personnel problems. As I see it, efficiency has little to do with scholarly activity and in fact it may be one of the real enemies of an inquiring mind.

I hope that the senate will stand up and say "No more of this."